

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1, 5-7, 11-13, 15-19, 32, 34, and 36-42 and rejected same. With this paper, claims 1, 7, 13, 15-19, 32, 34, 36 and 37 are amended, none are canceled, and none are added. Support for the amendment of claims 7, 13, 16, 17 and 19 changing from means-plus-function to element can be found in Fig. 1 of the specification.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §112

Claims 32, 34 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. With this paper, these claims are amended as indicated. It is believed the basis for the rejection, as indicated in page 7, first and second paragraphs of the Detailed Action, has been obviated. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103

The Office rejected claims based on the following grounds:

Claims 1, 7, 11, 13, 15-19, 32, 34 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh-Yang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,351,820, referred to as Oh-Yang hereinafter) in view of Khouli et al. (U.S. Patent 6,308,278, referred to as Khouli hereinafter).

Claims 5-6, 12 and 38-42 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh-Yang in view of Khouli and further in view of Lindskog et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0132603).

In the rejected claims, claims 1, 7, 13, 16, 17, 19, 32, 34, 36 and 37 are independent.

Regarding claim 1, Oh-Yang teaches a PC card 10 that is connectable to a computer interface 80 of a computer system. The card has a normal state and a sleep state. In col. 5, line 66 to col. 6, line 3, Oh-Yang teaches that the computer system may directly give commands to the PC card to change the PC card into the sleep state or to resume the normal state.

As acknowledged by the Office, Oh-Yang fails to teach the method comprising:

*a data line,
transmitting to the terminal an indication of mode change via the data line of the
interface, and
the indication of mode change in the card is transmitted in such a manner that a state of
the data line is set in a first logical state after the command has been received in the card, and
the state of the data line is set in a second logical state after the normal mode is in use in the
card. (See page 9, lines 1-6 of the Detailed Action)*

The second reference, Khouli, teaches a computer having a power management device to supply the computer and various peripheral devices connected to the computer a normal voltage or a standby voltage. The peripheral devices, which include keyboard, mouse, modem, LAN controller, monitor or display, are monitored by an I/O device of the computer. When the computer is in the power saving mode (i.e. the standby voltage is supplied), the I/O device detects any activity in the peripheral devices and generates a control signal (such as a SCI signal) to wake up the computer (i.e. switch to normal voltage supply).

In Khouli, the control signal is generated by the I/O device, for example, in response to a detected LAN controller activity. This control signal is an indication of an activity in a peripheral device. However, even if the control signal is an indication that the LAN controller has changed from inactivity to activity (as alleged by the Examiner on page 4, lines 11-16 of the Detailed Action), it is clearly not a response to a mode change command from the computer.

With this paper, claim 1 is amended to particularly recite that the terminal transmits a command to change the mode of the card, and the card transmits to the terminal an indication of the mode change **in response to the mode change command**. It is now unmistakable that the indication of the mode change and the command from the terminal are correspondent to each other. Without the command for mode change, there would be no indication of mode change in response to it.

Based on the above, Applicant believes that the amended claim 1 does not read on the combination of Oh-Yang and Khouli. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC §103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

All other independent claims of the application are amended accordingly. Therefore, these claims are patentable as well. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 7, 13, 16, 17, 19, 32, 34, 36 and 37, and all the dependent claims thereof, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the remaining claims in the application are allowable, and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicant's attorney urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present response if anything in the present response is unclear or unpersuasive.

30-JAN-08

Date

Ware, Fressola, Van Der Sluys & Adolphson LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Customer No.: 004955

Respectfully submitted,

Francis Maguire

Francis J. Maguire
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 31,391